

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 5, 8, and 17 have been amended, claims 2-4, 6-7 and 9-15 have been cancelled, and claims 18-20 have been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 8 and 16-20 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

The Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that claims 6-7 (cancelled), 8, and 13-15 (cancelled) have been found to contain allowable subject matter. However, as described in more detail below, independent claim 1, from which claim 8 depends, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is allowable as is.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action, at page 2, claims 1, 2 (cancelled), 5, 9 (cancelled), 12 (cancelled), 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,333,615, issued to Maezawa et al. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended. However, because Maezawa may still relate to the present invention, and with respect to the remaining claims, the rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Regarding claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that Maezawa fails to teach or suggest:

wherein said synchronous control device synchronously controls two servomotors for driving the same control object and further comprises means for reducing the force that acts between the two servomotors on the basis of the force that acts between the two servomotors,

and wherein the position control unit comprises:

a position deviation offset calculation processor for calculating the offset amount of the position deviation on the basis of the force that acts between the two servomotors, and

means for adding the position deviation offset amount

calculated by the position deviation offset calculation processor to the position deviation,

and wherein the position deviation offset calculation processor computes the force that acts between the two servomotors from the difference in the torque commands given to the two servomotors, and calculates the position deviation offset amount by multiplying the computed difference by a conversion coefficient.

Regarding claims 16 and 17 (currently amended), the rejection is respectfully traversed because Maezawa fails to teach or suggest:

said synchronous control device synchronously controls two servomotors to drive the same control object and reduces the force that acts between the two servomotors on the basis of the force that acts between the two servomotors (claim 16); and the synchronous control device controls such that the force between the two servomotors is reduced based on the force that acts between the two servomotors (claim 17).

While Maezawa does mention that "an excessive torque can be prevented from occurring," the reference does not mention reducing a force that acts between the two servomotors on the basis of the force that acts between the two servomotors. Rather, Maezawa discusses obtaining "[p]osition droops produced in main and auxiliary servo motors when main and auxiliary spindles are coupled to each other through a workpiece..." *Maezawa, abstract*. The position droops are then used to adjust the speed of an auxiliary servomotor to prevent excessive torque. *Id.* Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Maezawa, at most, teaches reducing a force based on a difference in position droops, and not based on the force that acts between the two servomotors, as now recited in claims 16 and 17.

The Applicants respectfully submit that since Maezawa fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1, 16 and 17, these claims are allowable over Maezawa. Thus, withdrawal of the 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 5, this claim depends directly on independent claim 1 and is therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons noted above.

#### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

In the Office Action, at page 3, claims 3, 4, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maezawa in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 04-065701 issued to Okada Kiyoshi ("Okada"). Claims 3, 4, 10 and 11 have been cancelled.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Jan 10, 2006

By: Gregory W. Harper  
Gregory W. Harper  
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501